

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 284 357

EA 019 570

AUTHOR Barrett, Diane L.; Bieger, George R.
TITLE Sex Role, Self-Esteem, and Leadership Characteristics of Male and Female Teachers and Administrators.
PUB DATE 21 Apr 87
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Characteristics; *Androgyny; Elementary Secondary Education; Females; Leadership; *Leadership Qualities; School Surveys; *Self Esteem; *Sex Differences; *Sex Role; Sex Stereotypes; Teacher Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS *American Association of School Administrators; Bem Sex Role Inventory; Coopersmith Self Esteem Inventory; Leadership Opinion Questionnaire; Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

The incongruity between the stereotypical female role and the leader role accounts for the scarcity of female administrators in the United States. The solution seems to be androgyny, or the mixing of masculine and feminine characteristics. A recent survey sampled 28 male teachers, 25 female teachers, 27 male administrators, and 22 female administrators from central Pennsylvania to assess their sex role, self-esteem, and leadership qualities, and to determine what impact sex role has on self-esteem and leadership. The anonymous questionnaires employed the Short Bem Sex-Role Inventory, the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory, and the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. The survey results revealed that fewer female teachers were androgynous than hypothesized; more female administrators were androgynous than expected; more female teachers were feminine than expected; administrators scored higher on self-esteem than teachers; relationships existed between self-esteem and masculinity, self-esteem and age, and self-esteem and years of service; administrators of either gender scored higher than teachers of either gender in masculinity; androgynous and masculine subjects showed a higher degree of structure than undifferentiated subjects; and androgynous groups showed higher scores on the consideration dimension than all other groups. (RG)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED284357

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Diane
Barrett

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

**SEX ROLE, SELF ESTEEM, AND LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS OF
MALE AND FEMALE TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS**

Diane L. Barrett, Canton, Pennsylvania Area School District
George R. Bieger, Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association.

April 21, 1987

Washington, D.C.

Running head: Male/Female Teachers and Administrators

EA 019 570

SEX ROLE, SELF ESTEEM, AND LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS OF
MALE AND FEMALE TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS

ABSTRACT

Questionnaires intended to measure sex role, self-esteem, and leadership were sent to 180 administrators and teachers in central Pennsylvania. Questionnaires were returned by 53 teachers and 49 administrators. Results of a $2 \times 2 \times 4$ (Gender by Job by Sex Role) ANOVA indicated that administrators, regardless of gender, scored higher in masculinity than did teachers, and that there was a two-way interaction between job and gender with masculinity. There were no differences between male and female teachers, but female administrators scored higher in masculinity than did teachers of either gender, and male administrators were higher in masculinity than female administrators and male and female teachers. Additionally, those subjects classified as having an androgynous sex role were found also to have a leadership style higher in consideration than subjects of all other sex roles. These results indicate that there are some characteristics that are shared by administrators regardless of gender and that some of these characteristics distinguish administrators from their teacher counterparts.

SEX ROLE, SELF ESTEEM, AND LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS OF MALE AND FEMALE TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS

The American Association of School Administrators conducted a study in 1982 and found that women held only 16% of all United States principalships. Twenty-three percent of United States elementary principals and 7% of United States secondary principals are women. According to the same study, only 1.8% of all superintendents are women (Jones & Montenegro, 1982).

Several factors are commonly cited to explain the small number of women in leadership in United States education. According to Metzger (1985), these factors include the following: "sex-role stereotyping, sex discrimination, personal and family-imposed constraints, women's low career aspirations, women's lack of self-confidence and initiative, women's lack of sponsors within the existing power structure, and an insufficient pool of highly qualified women" (p. 292).

In an article on sex-role conflict, Erickson (1985) discussed the role of the principal as one which "calls for characteristics generally thought of as masculine: strength, assertiveness, the ability to remain cool and to control one's emotions, independence" (p. 288). She also maintains that "female school administrators must struggle with two kinds of conflict: internal conflict, which has its roots in the process of socialization, and external conflict which comes from the job and the home" (p. 288). As an answer to the role conflict that female administrators struggle with, Erickson suggests that androgyny is the key. She states that "the androgynous person uses a full range of situation-appropriate behaviors, regardless of whether those behaviors are typically considered to be masculine or feminine" (p. 288). Erickson (1985) believes that "if women administrators understand the concept of androgyny and are able to practice it, they will function more effectively in their dual and often conflicting roles of female and administrator" (p. 288).

In their work on sex roles and leadership, Jacobson and Effertz (1974) agree that the traditional sex role for women hardly consists of the characteristics and traits that could adequately equip women for leadership roles. They cite a report by Bardwick and Douran (1972) in which the authors state that "women are characterized by qualities such as dependence, passivity, fragility, nonaggression, noncompetitiveness, yieldingness, inability to risk, and emotionality" (p. 384). The male sex role seems quite consistent with what are generally thought to be leadership qualities. According to Bardwick et al., these characteristics are "assertiveness, courage, confidence, rationality, and emotional control" (p. 384). If, indeed, the role of leader is antagonistic to women's sex role, it should cause them to experience role conflict.

Based on studies that have shown that androgynous women are higher in self-esteem than feminine women (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975); that they have fewer behavioral deficits in situations requiring independence or initiative (Bem, 1975); that they show greater maturity in moral judgment (Spence et al., 1975); and that they attribute success to their own capabilities (Welch & Huston, 1982), androgyny does, indeed, seem to be the key to effective female school administrators.

What are the characteristics of women who aspire to the same leadership positions as men? How are they similar to men in these fields, and how do they differ from women who choose not to move into leadership positions? This particular study addresses the area of educational administration and the characteristics of male and female school administrators. What characteristics do they have in common, and what are the characteristics that set them apart from teachers?

The answer seems to lie in the sex-role orientation of the individual. Through the years, the male sex role is seen to be compatible with leadership while the female is not, resulting in differential expectancies for the two sexes (Jacobson et al., 1974). The male sex role seems quite consistent with what are generally thought to be leadership qualities (Bardwick et al., 1972), whereas the traditional sex role for women hardly consists of traits and characteristics that would adequately equip women for leadership roles (Jacobson et al., 1974). They maintain that if the concept of leadership is masculine, it is probably because most leaders are and have been men. Traditional sex roles are undergoing change, and as more and more women occupy positions of leadership, it will be seen that womanhood and leadership are not necessarily incompatible or antagonistic (p. 394).

Because the role of the principal calls for characteristics generally thought of as masculine, women are required to make more personality shifts than men (Erickson, 1985). Erickson believes that women administrators will function better in their role if they understand and practice the concept of androgyny.

Psychological androgyny is a term that denotes the integration of both masculinity and femininity within a single individual (Bem, 1977). The concept of psychological androgyny implies that it is possible for an individual to be both assertive and compassionate, both instrumental and expressive, both masculine and feminine, depending upon the situational appropriateness of these various modalities. It further implies that "an individual may even blend these complimentary modalities in a single act, being able, for example, to fire an employee if the circumstances warrant it, but with sensitivity for the human emotion that such an act inevitably produces" (Bem, 1977, p. 196).

In laboratory studies, Bem and Lenney (1967) have found that androgynous individuals not only perform cross-sex behavior with very little reluctance or discomfort, but they also display high levels of both masculine independence and feminine nurturance when the situation seems to call for it.

Bem, Martyna, and Watson (1976) cite Parsons and Bales (1955) in stating that "masculinity has been associated with an instrumental orientation, a cognitive focus on getting the job done or the problem solved, whereas femininity has been associated with an expressive orientation, an effective concern for the welfare of others and the harmony of the group" (p. 1016). Androgynous individuals of both sexes are capable of being both nurturant and independent, both expressive and instrumental, both feminine and masculine (Bem et al., 1976).

Yanico (1981, cited in Cook, 1985) proposed that attitudes about sex roles influence the relationship between sex-role identity and career choices. A woman with a masculine sex-role identity might make different occupational choices than a masculine woman with traditional sex-role attitudes (p. 134 in Cook). Cook states in her book, Psychological Androgyny (1985), that sex roles correspond to two dimensions used to describe central personality traits and tasks to be performed in society: the agentic/instrumental and the communal/expressive. She describes agentic/instrumental as showing goal-directed action, assertion, and autonomy, and communal/expressive as showing interdependence, emotional awareness, and cooperation. The need for both is present in everyone to some degree and represents equally valid components of social interaction. Traditionally, men's characteristics and activities have largely been linked to the agentic/instrumental and women's to the communal/expressive. "What has differed across societies is the manner in which the sexes have been

expected to carry out their prescribed functions and to what degree they have been permitted to express the 'other side' of their natures. Many mental health practitioners now regard a congenial balance between the two dimensions to be desirable" (p. 178 in Cook).

Lynn Erickson (1985) believes that an androgynous school administrator reacts to a given situation without regard to the cultural stereotypes for male and female behavior. "He or she feels equally comfortable hugging a child or reprimanding a staff member. The effective female administrator does not consciously fill an androgynous behavior quota. However, as she reacts competently to specific situations, she will achieve a natural balance between male behaviors and female ones" (p. 288). Erickson recommends that prospective female administrators should be given pre-training at the university on operating in a well-balanced androgynous or dichotomous, management style.

Thomas Sergiovanni (1979) believes that we need a more comprehensive approach that links the instrumental or managerial aspects of leadership with the more substantive aspects of leadership. He refers to an article by Gates, Blanchard, and Hersey (1976) in which they counsel us that "successful leaders are those who can adapt their behavior to meet the demands of their own unique environment" (cited in Sergiovanni, 1979, p. 389). Sergiovanni also refers to the leadership theories of Reddin and Fiedler. From the research, it seems that the best leaders are those who can apply both masculine and feminine behaviors, both instrumental and expressive behaviors, depending on the situation. It would seem that the androgynous person would function well in the leadership role.

In summary, in order to understand why so few women have occupied administrative positions in education, many researchers have looked at the

traditional female role. Characteristics of the traditional female role are generally inconsistent with the characteristics that are regarded as valuable for leaders. As Erickson (1985) pointed out, women are often required to make more personality shifts than men. The female school administrator must often struggle with two kinds of conflict: internal and external. To function more effectively in these conflicting roles, Erickson suggests that women administrators understand and practice the concept of psychological androgyny. In doing, so, they would be able to use a full range of situation-appropriate behaviors, regardless of whether the behaviors are considered to be masculine or feminine (Bem, 1975).

Androgynous individuals have at their disposal a wide repertoire of socially approved behaviors that are available for problem solution or for obtaining reinforcement in a variety of situations (Kelly et al., 1977). Androgyny has also been associated with high flexibility and high self-esteem (Orlofsky & Windle, 1978, cited in Cook, 1985).

The purpose of this study was to survey male and female school administrators and teachers, using appropriate measures to assess their sex role, degree of self-esteem, and leadership qualities, and to examine potential differences among them. It was hypothesized that female administrators would show a higher degree of masculinity than female teachers. The broader purpose of the study was to learn what effect sex role has on self-esteem and leadership in school administrators and teachers and to know where any differences lie. Are there any significant differences between the teachers and the administrators in the traits that we measured?

METHOD

Subjects

The population for this study came from seven Intermediate Units in central Pennsylvania. It was necessary to use such a large population in order to obtain the desired sample of female school administrators. The sample included 28 male teachers, 25 female teachers, 27 male administrators, and 22 female administrators.

At the administrative level, responses were received from 20 elementary principals, 3 junior high/middle school principals, 12 high school principals, 2 supervisors, and 12 superintendents. Responses were received from 27 elementary teachers, 3 junior high/middle school teachers, and 23 high school teachers.

Procedures

Questionnaires were mailed to subjects, and packets included the following: a greeting/explanation cover sheet (See Appendix B), a general information section (See Appendix C) to be completed along with the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory, and the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. Permission was granted by Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc. to use the Bem Sex-Role Inventory and the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (See Appendix D) and by Science Research Associates to use the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (See Appendix E) and to adapt these instruments to the questionnaire used for this particular study.

Subjects were asked to complete and return the questionnaire in the self-addressed, stamped envelope within a given two-week period. Subjects were not required to put their names or school on the questionnaire in order to grant them anonymity.

Instruments

The Short BSRI was used in this study. It includes exactly half of the items on the Original BSRI. The test consists of thirty personality characteristics. Ten of the characteristics are stereotypically feminine; ten are stereotypically masculine; and ten are filler items. When taking the BSRI, a person is asked to indicate on a 7-point scale how well each of the 30 characteristics describes himself or herself. The scale ranges from 1 (Never or almost never true) to 7 (Always or almost always true) and is labeled at each point.

The Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (CSI) was utilized to measure self-esteem of the subjects. The CSI is designed to measure evaluative attitudes toward the self in social, academic, family, and personal areas of experience.

The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) was used to measure leadership characteristics of the subjects. It provides measures of two important dimensions of supervisory leadership--Consideration and Structure. The two scores provided by this questionnaire are defined as follows:

Consideration (C). Reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to have job relationships with subordinates characterized by mutual trust, respect for their ideas, consideration of their feelings, and a certain warmth between the individual and them. A high score is indicative of a climate of good rapport and two-way communication. A low score indicates that the individual is likely to be more impersonal in relations with group members.

Structure (S). Reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to define and structure his or her own role and those of subordinates toward goal attainment. A high score on this dimension characterizes individual who play a very active role in directing group activities through planning, communicating information, scheduling, criticizing, trying out new ideas, and so forth. A low score characterizes individuals who are likely to be relatively inactive in giving direction in these ways.

RESULTS

A Chi Square was calculated to compare the number of observed sex roles with the number of expected sex roles in each occupational and gender category. A significant difference was found between the two ($\chi^2 = 19.013$, $p < .025$). It is interesting to note the high degree of differences between the expected and the observed numbers of subjects for the androgynous female teachers, the androgynous female administrators, and the feminine female teachers. It was expected that 5.882 female teachers would be Androgynous, but the observed was only 1. It was also expected that only 5.176 female administrators would be Androgynous, but 9 were observed to be Androgynous. It was expected that 6.373 female teachers would be Feminine, but the observed number was 12. In the other categories the number of observed sex roles was not substantially different from what was expected.

An ANOVA (sex role x sex x job) was performed to examine differences in self-esteem (see Table). The main effect for sex role (SR) on self-esteem (CSI) was not statistically significant, $F(3, 86) = .312$, $p = .817$, nor was there a significant main effect on CSI for SEX, $F(1, 86) = 1.777$, $p = .186$. There was however, a significant main effect on CSI as a function of JOB, $F(1, 86) = 12.723$, $p = .001$ (see Table). A description of the sample on CSI by JOB showed that the administrators scored higher on self-esteem ($M = 90.36730$) than the teachers ($M = 81.8113$).

Insert Table about here.

Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated on the variables total years, age, femininity, masculinity, self-esteem, leadership (Structure) and leadership (Consideration). A statistically significant, although not high,

correlation was found between self-esteem and masculinity. Relationships worth noting were found between self-esteem and age and between self-esteem and total years of service. Other significant relationships were found between the Masculinity dimension of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory and Structure and between the Femininity dimension and Consideration. Again, these correlations were not high, but they were significant.

The ANOVA that was performed to examine differences on the Masculinity dimension of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory as a function of sex and job revealed a significant main effect for job, $F(1,98) = 0.979$, $p = .002$, with administrators scoring higher in Masculinity than teachers. There was a significant two-way interaction between sex and job, $F(1,98) = 6.217$, $p = .014$. A description of the sample on the dependent variable Masculinity broken down by sex and job yielded a mean of 5.370 for the male teachers, 5.4963 for the male administrators, 5.0080 for the female teachers, and 5.8364 for the female administrators.

A oneway ANOVA was performed to examine differences in Masculinity scores for the following groups: Group 1 (Male Teachers), Group 2 (Female Teachers), Group 3 (Male Administrators), and Group 4 (Female Administrators). The analysis showed that there were significant differences, $F(3, 98) = 5.424$, $p = .0017$. A Least Significant Difference (LSD) posttest showed that female administrators differed significantly from female teachers ($p < .01$) on the Masculinity measure of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. An LSD posttest showed statistical differences between the female administrators and the female teachers, between the female administrators and the male teachers, and between the male administrators and the female teachers. All of these differences were significant at the $p < .05$ level. Female administrators scored significantly higher ($p < .05$) than both male

and female teachers, and male administrators scored significantly higher than female teachers ($p < .050$ on the Masculinity dimension).

ANOVAS were performed on each of the two dimensions of leadership (Structure and Consideration) with the independent variables being sex role, sex, and job. Significant main effects for sex role were found for the Structure dimension of the LOQ, $F(3, 86) = 3.727, p = .014$ and for the Consideration dimension of the LOQ, $F(3, 86) = 7.365, p < .001$.

An ANOVA was performed to examine differences in LOQS as a function of sex role which were found to be statistically significant, $F(3, 98) = 3.791, p = .0128$. LSD posttests were performed to further examine differences among the groups. Significant differences were found between Group 1 (Androgynous) and Group 4 (Undifferentiated) and between Group 2 (Masculine) and Group 4 (Undifferentiated), ($p < .01$), with Androgynous and Masculine subjects showing a higher degree of structure than the Undifferentiated subjects. At the $p < .05$ level, the Undifferentiated subjects were lower in structure than all other subjects.

The ANOVA to examine differences in LOQC as a function of sex role showed statistical differences among groups, $F(3, 98) = 8.290, p = .0001$. The LSD posttest indicated that, at the $p < .05$ level, the Androgynous group showed higher consideration than all other groups. A Scheffe posttest revealed significant differences ($p < .01$ level) between Groups 1 and 2 and between Groups 1 and 4. In other words, the Androgynous subjects were higher in consideration than the Masculine and Undifferentiated subjects.

DISCUSSION

Since the concept of leadership is masculine, it was hypothesized that the female administrators (leaders), in this study, would score higher on the Masculinity dimension of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory than the female teachers.

The findings did, indeed, support this hypothesis. This finding was statistically significant at the $p < .01$ level. At the $p < .05$ level, female administrators showed a higher degree of Masculinity than both male and female teachers. Because the women administrators, as a group, display a high degree of masculine characteristics, this may facilitate their performance in achievement situations (Welch and Huston, 1982).

The presence of this higher degree of masculinity probably affected, though perhaps not consciously, the decision made by these women to enter the field of school administration. Masculine characteristics are relevant to goal-directedness and achievement. Welch and Huston (1982) reported findings by Spence and Helmreich (1978) which indicated that women who achieve, particularly in masculine fields, are likely to be Androgynous or Masculine. In both cases, a high level of Masculinity is present.

Female leaders can probably be distinguished from female non-leaders by the presence of a high degree of masculinity. They were able to break away from the traditional feminine sex-role stereotype and develop some traditional masculine traits and skills which have come to be valued in leaders, such as assertiveness, goal-setting, and instrumentality.

The research finding that masculinity is present to a greater degree in the female administrators than in the female teachers suggests that masculinity is a dimension that could be measured and used, in part, for the selection of female leaders. Another possibility, and one which Erickson (1985) suggests, would be to train women who are interested in leadership positions to understand and practice the concept of androgyny--the blending of the positive traits of masculinity and femininity. This would be the ideal because it would develop leaders who are both instrumental and expressive. They would be assertive, yet sensitive to the needs of others.

Women in leadership positions often find it necessary to move out of the stereotypically feminine sex role and behave in a manner that is more typical of the masculine sex role. This may cause them to experience conflict if they are, at the same time, trying to be assertive to satisfy their own needs, yet are trying to be cooperative in an attempt to satisfy the needs of others. To resolve this conflict, it is often necessary for women in leadership positions to practice a blend of feminine and masculine traits. Psychological androgyny is the blending of masculine and feminine traits within an individual. The positive aspects of both traits produce a leadership style characterized by concern for both production and people.

The results of this study supported the hypothesis that the female administrators would show a higher degree of masculinity than the female teachers. To be effective, women in leadership positions must often behave in a manner that is thought to be masculine, such as being assertive or aggressive. The implications of this study and the possibilities for further research are many. Should women in leadership positions be encouraged to practice the concept of androgyny? For that matter, is the practice of psychological androgyny the means to effective leadership qualities in both males and females? Should prospective school administrators be given training in operating in an androgynous style?

In their book, Sex-Role Psychology (1977), Wesley and Wesley quote Bem (1975) as saying that "individual androgyny would mean that each man as well as each woman can be aggressive and also submissive, daring and also cautious, dependent and also independent, etc., and that each can select from these opposite traits what is most effective at the moment; (p. 168 in Wesley et al.). Bem believes that it is quite possible that in the future androgyny will constitute a new basis for psychological health (Bem, 1975, p. 643).

References

- Bardwick, J. M., & Douvan, E. (1972). Ambivalence: The Socialization of Women. In J. M. Bardwick, Readings on the Psychology of Women. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bem, S. L. (1981). Bem Sex-Role Inventory--Professional Manual. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
- Bem, S. L. (1977). On the Utility of Alternative Procedures for Assessing Psychological Androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45, 196-205.
- Bem, S. L. (1975). Sex Role Adaptability: One Consequence of Psychological Androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31, 634-643.
- Bem, S. L., & Lenney, E. (1976). Sex Typing and the Avoidance of Cross-Sex Behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 48-54.
- Bem, S. L., Martyna, W., & Watson, C. (1976). Sex Typing and Androgyny: Further Explorations of the Expressive Domain. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34, 1016-1023.
- Bowker, J. E., Hinkle, D. E., & Worner, W. M. (1983). Do Women Aspire to the Same Administrative Positions as Men? Educational Administration Quarterly, 19, 64-81.
- Cook, E. P. (1985). Psychological Androgyny. New York: Pergamon Press Inc.
- Coopersmith, S. (1984). Self-Esteem Inventories. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
- Erickson, H. L. (1985). Conflict and the Female Principal. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 228-291.
- Fleishman, E. A. (1969). Leadership Opinion Questionnaire Examiner's Manual. Chicago, IL: Science Research Associates, Inc.
- Haccoun, D. M., Sallay, G., & Haccoun, R. R. (1978). Sex Differences in the Appropriate Supervisory Styles: A Non-Management View. Journal of Applied Psychology, 63, 124-127.
- Jacobson, M. B., & Effertz, J. (1974). Sex Roles and Leadership--Perceptions of the Leaders and the Led. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 12, 383-396.
- Jones, E., & Montenegro, X. (1982). Recent Trends in the Representation of Women and Minorities in School Administration and Problems in Documentation. Arlington, VA: Office of Minority Affairs, American Association of School Administrators.

- Kelly, J. A., & Worell, J. (1977). New Formulations of Sex Roles and Androgyny: A Critical Review. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45, 1101-1115.
- Metzger, C. (1985). Helping Women Prepare for Principalships. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 292-296.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1977). Is Leadership the Next Great Training Robbery? Educational Leadership, 36, 392-394.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1975). Rating of Self and Person Sex-Role Attributes and Their Relation to Self-Esteem and Conceptions of Masculinity and Femininity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 29-39.
- Weber, M. B., Feldman, J. R., & Poling, E. C. (1981) Why Women Are Underrepresented in Educational Administration. Educational Leadership, 38, 320-322.
- Weich, R. L., & Huston, A. C. (1982). Effects of Induced Success/Failure and Attributions on the Problem-Solving Behavior of Psychologically Androgynous and Feminine Women. Journal of Personality, 50, 81-97.
- Worell, J. (1978). Sex Roles and Psychological Well-Being: Perspectives and Methodology. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 48, 777-790.
- Yarnold, P. R. (1984). Note on the Multidisciplinary Scope of Psychological Androgyny Theory. Psychological Reports, 54, 936-938.

Table

Analysis of Variance: Self-Esteem and Sex Role

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Sex Role (SR)	112.827	3	37.609	.312	.817
Sex	214.565	1	214.565	1.777	.186
Job	1535.920	1	1535.920	12.723	.001
SR by Sex	773.813	3	257.938	2.137	.101
SR by Job	715.371	3	238.457	1.975	.124
Sex by Job	48.109	1	48.109	.399	.530
SR by Sex by Job	894.798	3	298.266	2.471	.067
Error	10382.185	86	230.723		